United Nations A/HRC/27/45

General Assembly

Distr.: General
7 July 2014

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Twenty-seventh session
Agenda item 3
Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development

Report of the Working Group on the Right to Development on its fifteenth session (Geneva, 12-16 May 2014)*

Chair-Rapporteur: Tamara Kunanayakam (Sri Lanka)

* Annex II to the present report is circulated in the language of submission only.

GE.14-07879 (E)

1407879

Please recycle

Contents

		Paragraphs	*Page*
I.	Introduction	1–14	3
II.	Organization of the session	15–23	5
III.	Summary of proceedings	24–81	7
	A. General statements	24–48	7
	B. Inter-sessional meeting and informal consultations by the Chair	49–66	13
	C. Submissions of groups of States, States, regional groups and other stakeholders	67–74	15
	D. Review of progress in the implementation of the right to development, including consideration, revision and refinement of the right to development criteria and operational subcriteria	75–81	17
IV.	Conclusions and recommendations	82–90	19
	A. Conclusions	83–89	19
	B. Recommendations	90	20
Annexes			
I.	Agenda		21
II.	List of attendance		22

I. Introduction

1. The open-ended Working Group on the Right to Development was established pursuant to Commission on Human Rights resolution 1998/72, endorsed by the Economic and Social Council in its decision 1998/269, initially for a period of three years, to meet for a period of five working days each year, with a mandate to monitor and review progress made in the promotion and implementation of the right to development, as elaborated in the Declaration on the Right to Development, at the national and international levels, providing recommendations thereon and further analysing obstacles to its full enjoyment, focusing each year on specific commitments in the Declaration; to review reports and any other information submitted by States, United Nations agencies, other relevant international organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) on the relationship between their activities and the right to development; and to present for the consideration of the Commission on Human Rights a sessional report on its deliberations, including advice to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) with regard to the implementation of the right to development, and suggesting possible programmes of technical assistance at the request of interested countries with the aim of promoting the implementation of the right to development. The Commission also decided that an independent expert should be appointed by its Chairman, initially for a period of three years, with a mandate to present to the Working Group at each of its sessions a study on the current state of progress in the implementation of the right to development, taking into account, inter alia, the deliberations and suggestions of the Working Group.

2. In its resolution 2000/5, the Commission on Human Rights welcomed the consensus reached between all parties on the need for the Working Group to convene in two sessions, of five days each, before the fifty-seventh session of the Commission.

3. In view of the urgent need to make further progress towards the realization of the right to development as elaborated in the Declaration on the Right to Development, the Commission, in its resolution 2001/9, decided to extend the mandate of the Working Group for one year and the mandate of the independent expert for three years.

4. In resolution 2002/69, the Commission on Human Rights emphasized the international economic and financial issues that deserved particular attention by the Working Group, and decided to extend its mandate by one year to continue important deliberations and deepening dialogue on the operationalization of the right to development.

5. In resolution 2003/83, the Commission on Human Rights decided to renew the mandate of the Working Group for one year and to convene it, for a period of 10 working days, to consider the report of the independent expert on the right to development as well as the outcome of a two-day high-level seminar on effective strategies for mainstreaming the right to development in the policies and operational activities of the major international organizations/institutions, to be organized by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights within the 10 working days allocated to the Working Group.

6. In resolution 2004/7, the Commission decided to renew the mandate of the Working Group for one year, to meet for 10 working days. It also endorsed the recommendation of the Working Group at its fifth session to establish, for an initial period of one year, a high-level task force on the implementation of the right to development, within the framework of the Working Group and in accordance with the terms of reference defined by it, to assist it in fulfilling its mandate as contained in paragraph 10 (a) of Commission resolution 1998/72, and to allocate to the task force 5 of the 10 working days allocated to the Working Group.

7. In resolution 2005/4, the Commission decided to renew the mandate of the Working Group for one year and to convene it for a period of 10 working days, 5 of them to be allocated to a second meeting of the high-level task force. It endorsed the recommendation of the Working Group at its sixth session to extend the mandate of the high-level task force for a further period of one year to examine Millennium Development Goal 8, on global partnership for development, and suggest criteria for its periodic evaluation, with the aim of improving the effectiveness of global partnerships with regard to the realization of the right to development.

8. In its resolution 1/4, the Human Rights Council endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of the Working Group at its seventh session, inter alia to renew the mandate of the high-level task force for a further period of one year to enable it to apply the criteria enumerated in its report, on a pilot basis, to selected partnerships, with a view to operationalizing and progressively developing those criteria. The Council also decided to renew the mandate of the Working Group for a period of one year, to meet for a period of five working days to consider the findings and recommendations of the task force and further initiatives in accordance with its mandate, and requested the high-level task force to meet for a period of five working days.

9. In resolution 4/4, the Human Rights Council endorsed the road map outlined in paragraphs 52 to 54 of the Working Group's report on its eighth session, including a request to the high-level task force to consolidate its findings and present a revised list of right to development criteria along with corresponding operational subcriteria and outline suggestions for further work, including aspects of international cooperation not covered until then. The Council decided that the criteria, as endorsed by the Working Group, should be used, as appropriate, in the elaboration of a comprehensive and coherent set of standards for the implementation of the right to development, and that, upon completion of the above phases, the Working Group should take appropriate steps to ensure respect for and the practical application of those standards, which could take various forms, including guidelines on the implementation of the right to development, and evolve into a basis for consideration of an international legal standard of a binding nature, through a collaborative process of engagement. In the same resolution, the Council also decided to renew the Working Group's mandate for a period of two years, to convene in annual sessions of five working days, and to renew the mandate of the high-level task force for a period of two years, to convene in annual sessions of seven working days.

10. In resolution 9/3 and in successive resolutions,[1] most recently resolution 24/4, the Human Rights Council reiterated the tasks entrusted to the Working Group in resolution 4/4, the purposes set out therein for which the criteria would serve once considered, revised and endorsed by the Working Group, and the steps to be taken by the Working Group upon completion. In resolution 9/3, the Council decided to renew the mandate of the Working Group until it had completed those tasks, and that it should convene annual sessions of five working days. The Council also decided to renew the mandate of the high-level task force until the eleventh session of the Working Group, in 2010, and that the task force would convene annual sessions of seven working days.

11. In resolution 12/23, the Human Rights Council tasked the Working Group to consider, revise and endorse the right to development criteria and corresponding operational subcriteria.

12. In resolution 21/32, the Human Rights Council welcomed the launching in the Working Group of the process of considering, revising and refining the draft right to

[1] Human Rights Council resolutions 12/23, 15/25, 18/26 and 19/34.

development criteria and corresponding operational subcriteria, with the first reading of the draft criteria; acknowledged the need to further consider, revise and refine them; endorsed the recommendation of the Working Group that it pursue, at its fourteenth session, consideration of the draft operational subcriteria; decided to convene a two-day informal inter-sessional intergovernmental meeting of the Working Group with the participation of States, groups of States and relevant United Nations agencies, funds and programmes and institutions, as well as other multilateral institutions and forums, international organizations and relevant stakeholders, with a view to improve its effectiveness at its fourteenth session; and decided to consider the extension of the meeting time of the Working Group, as appropriate.

13. In resolution 24/4, the Human Rights Council endorsed the recommendation of the Working Group that it continue, at its fifteenth session, work on the consideration of the draft operational subcriteria with the first reading of the remaining operational subcriteria. The Council also decided to convene a two-day informal inter-sessional intergovernmental meeting of the Working Group with a view to improve its effectiveness at its fifteenth session, and reiterated its decision to consider the extension of the meeting time of the Working Group, as appropriate.

14. The Working Group accordingly held a two-day informal inter-sessional meeting on 3 and 4 April 2014, and convened its fifteenth session in Geneva from 12 to 16 May 2014.

II. Organization of the session

15. In her opening statement,[2] the High Commissioner for Human Rights underscored the progress made in the recognition of the transformative potential of the right to development. It was now widely acknowledged that the right to development could contribute to a new paradigm for sustainable and equitable social justice built on the firm normative foundations of human rights. The High Commissioner recalled that it was mandatory to meet the needs of future generations, so that they could enjoy rights and economic opportunities in conditions of dignity and sustainability. She called upon the Working Group to guide the international community with a view to positioning the right to development in the post-2015 development agenda. The parameters of the right to development could inform the global debate on creating development that freed all human beings from fear and from want. Procedurally and substantially, the post-2015 development agenda must have the right to development at its core. The new development agenda's goals, targets and indicators must explicitly align the development framework with human rights, including the right to development. Furthermore, the new development agenda must include a strong accountability framework that clearly identified the holders of rights and those responsible for fulfilling rights. It must also define mechanisms at all levels to ensure that relevant institutions were answerable for meeting their responsibilities, and were subject to enforceability where they did not deliver. Every human person and all peoples were entitled to a development process in which all human rights could be fully realized. That recognition was at the core of the human rights-based approach to development, and the responsibility for such development should be expanded to include actors in the private sector, notably large and transnational corporations.

[2] The full text of the High Commissioner's statement is available from www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Development/Pages/15thSession.aspx.

16. At its first meeting, on 12 May 2014, the Working Group re-elected by acclamation Tamara Kunanayakam (Sri Lanka) as Chair-Rapporteur. In her opening statement,[3] the Chair-Rapporteur reported on activities since the previous session of the Working Group, namely the informal consultations and the informal inter-sessional meeting. In addition, she reported on the results of her interactive dialogue at the twenty-fourth session of the Human Rights Council and at the sixty-eighth session of the General Assembly. During its previous two sessions, the Working Group had completed the first reading of the criteria and the first part of the operational subcriteria, aided by the submission of detailed views and comments. It had also been assisted by the active participation of United Nations funds and programmes, NGOs and indigenous peoples' groups.

17. The Chair-Rapporteur reminded the Working Group that the first reading of the draft operational subcriteria was part of a broader and longer-term process. She recalled Human Rights Council resolution 24/4, in which the Council had decided that, once considered, revised and endorsed by the Working Group, the criteria and corresponding operational subcriteria should be used, as appropriate, in the elaboration of a comprehensive and coherent set of standards for the implementation of the right to development, and that the Working Group should take appropriate steps to ensure the practical application of the standards, which could take various forms, including guidelines on the implementation of the right to development, and evolve into a basis for consideration of an international legal standard of a binding nature through a collaborative process of engagement.

18. Several proposals had emerged from the inter-sessional meetings on improving the effectiveness of the fifteenth session, and they remained on the table. She expressed the hope that, following past tradition, the Group's conclusions and recommendations would be adopted by consensus.

19. The Chair-Rapporteur drew attention to the context in which the fifteenth session was being held. The International Year of Small Island Developing States was a reminder of the gravity of the current global crisis, its multidimensional and systemic character and the urgent need for collective action when those States were facing unprecedented challenges in achieving development, with climate change threatening their very existence,. Rising inequalities, within and between countries, unequally affecting those more closely integrated in the global market and less resilient to external influences, along with intensifying exploitation and social injustice, posed a threat to international peace and security, as well as to the ability of the planet to sustain life. There was increasing recognition that inequality was a key issue that had been neglected in the Millennium Development Goals.

20. The post-2015 process provided an opportunity for the Working Group to contribute actively to shaping the development agenda. With the mandate to promote a vision of development based on the principles of equality, non-discrimination, social justice, participation and solidarity at national and international levels, and international cooperation, and also to mainstream the right to development in the United Nations system, the Working Group was in a privileged position to contribute significantly to advancing the framework for an alternative vision of society, based on values and principles, and in harmony with the environment, so that life with dignity became a reality for all without discrimination, for present and future generations.

21. She expressed the hope that the fifteenth anniversary of the Working Group would provide inspiration to move forward with the sense of urgency that the current global

[3] The Chair-Rapporteur's opening statement is available from www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Development/Pages/15thSession.aspx.

situation demanded, to confront and eliminate the obstacles standing in the way of development, to translate commitments into concrete action and to create the conditions for the enjoyment of the inalienable right to development for all peoples, everywhere.

22. At its first meeting, the Working Group adopted the agenda (see annex I) and programme of work of its fifteenth session.

23. During the session, the Working Group finalized the first reading of the remaining draft right to development operational subcriteria proposed by the high-level task force on the implementation of the right to development. It also proposed draft operational subcriteria for new draft criteria that were proposed during the Group's thirteenth session. For that purpose, the Working Group had before it two conference room papers (A/HRC/WG.2/15/CRP.3 and 4) containing, respectively, submissions received from Governments, groups of Governments and regional groups, and from other stakeholders.

III. Summary of proceedings

A. General statements

24. On behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), the Islamic Republic of Iran stated that the right to development must be given the high profile it deserved. It expressed serious concern that, despite longstanding efforts, progress had been slow and obstacles to realizing the right to development still persisted. The challenges were becoming more complex and it was now more than ever necessary to make the right to development a reality for all. The United Nations system organizations, including in the areas of finance and trade, must be involved and all relevant bodies should be engaged in mainstreaming the right to development into their objectives, policies and programmes. NAM stressed its unwavering commitment to the right to development, an individual and collective right involving individual, national and international responsibilities, and requiring a balance between national and international responsibilities. All human rights were interdependent and mutually reinforcing. The Working Group must continue the first reading of the criteria and subcriteria and proceed to the second reading. Once adopted, they would be comprehensive and coherent standards, providing a basis for international legal standards of a binding nature. They would enable implementation of the Declaration on the Right to Development. The ultimate goal of that process was the implementation of the right to development for all human beings.

25. The European Union (EU) expressed its strong commitment to sustainable development, the eradication of poverty and equitable globalization. It reiterated its support for the right to development, on the basis of the indivisibility and interdependence of all human rights and the multidimensional nature of development strategies. While national development efforts must be supported, States had primary responsibility for the realization of the right to development by their citizens. The ambitious programme of work of the Working Group was attainable and EU was willing to pursue a consensual approach to rise above polarization and focus on what united rather than what divided.

26. Pakistan, on behalf of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), stated that realizing the right to development was crucial to the realization of all other human rights, including in the industrialized world, and called for collective responsibility of all human beings. Realization of the right to development required political commitment and resources. Sustainable development demanded efforts at the national level, which should be supported at the international level through collective efforts. The goal of sustainable development must become a reality on the ground. The Working Group should proceed to the second reading, and extension of its meeting time should be considered.

27. Speaking on behalf of the African Group and aligning itself with NAM, Ethiopia affirmed the great importance attached to the right to development, also enshrined in the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights. While States had the primary responsibility for realizing the right to development, there was an urgent need for a just and enabling international economic order and a responsive and accountable global financial architecture. States should have the necessary policy space to determine policies suited to their specific conditions. Ethiopia stressed that the right to development must be included in the post-2015 development agenda and the necessary framework for international cooperation, and reiterated the call for a legally binding instrument to ensure the full implementation of the right to development.

28. Aligning itself with NAM, Sri Lanka stated that the right to development was about mainstreaming and implementing development-oriented policies at all levels, to improve the capacity of States to ensure the full enjoyment of all human rights. The right to development was the basis for sustainable development, in all its three dimensions. Asserting that the eradication of poverty was the most urgent human rights goal, Sri Lanka called for greater focus on the special needs of developing countries and advocated the integration of youth participation in the post-2015 agenda.

29. Aligning itself with NAM, Cuba stated that the right to development was an inalienable right of individuals and peoples, and its achievement required international cooperation and the creation of a conducive international environment. The adverse consequences of the neo-liberal agenda posed obstacles to developing countries and also affected developed countries. Much could be achieved with a genuine will on the part of developed countries. For the people of Cuba, the main obstacle to enjoying the right to development was the unjustified economic embargo by the United States of America for over 50 years. Cuba rejected all attempts to redefine the right to development and to limit its international scope, including with regard to trade and financial institutions.

30. Sri Lanka reiterated that it was imperative that the Declaration on the Right to Development should be the basis for further consideration, revision and refinement of the criteria and subcriteria in order to achieve real progress, and that effective international cooperation was essential to address the international obstacles and create an international climate conducive to the realization of the right to development.

31. China expressed its support for NAM and remarked that the right to development required a development-based and human-centred approach and the establishment of a new international economic order which removed obstacles to development faced by developing countries. The commitment to the Millennium Development Goals must be honoured and the post-2015 agenda must put development at its heart. Developed countries must adopt responsible macroeconomic policies, and international development cooperation must respect the development paths of all countries, the diversity of development patterns and different levels of development. An open, interconnected world economy, a cooperative and mutually beneficial global partnership, and transfer of technology must be promoted and supported.

32. South Africa aligned itself with the African Group and NAM. It consistently advocated for the right to development, which presented a holistic, cohesive and integrated framework for advancing development and for achieving the Millennium Development Goals and all three dimensions of sustainable development. The eradication of poverty and hunger, and combating inequality must be at the centre of the global agenda and partnership for development, which must acknowledge different levels of development and uphold common but differentiated responsibilities. South Africa reiterated the need for reform and democratization of global institutions, including the Security Council and the Bretton Woods Institutions, and the need to ensure the accountability of transnational corporations. It expressed dismay at the slow pace of progress in the Working Group.

33. Venezuela aligned itself with NAM and reiterated the sentiments expressed by Cuba. It reaffirmed that the post-2015 development agenda must fully integrate the right to development, which was essential to human rights. Unilateral coercive measures against developing countries hampered economic development and set aside international solidarity. The international community must create an enabling environment for the full enjoyment of all human rights. The prevailing economic system promoted climate change, including through the activities of transnational corporations. Lack of transfer of technology also compromised development.

34. Aligning itself with NAM and OIC, Malaysia asserted that the Working Group was a pillar for upholding the right to development. Differences in viewpoints were natural because of divergent approaches to development, differences in the economic, social and cultural particularities of countries and diversity in perspectives. Participation by all was important for a holistic process. While responsibilities lay primarily with States, international cooperation was essential for realizing the right to development. It was important to complete the task at hand in a spirit of constructive engagement, and that the meeting duration be increased to two weeks.

35. Indonesia, aligning itself with NAM and OIC, pledged its full commitment to the right to development, which encompassed all human rights. While States had the primary responsibility for realizing the right to development, international cooperation for the creation of an enabling environment was crucial. The right to development must be mainstreamed in all development processes throughout the United Nations system.

36. Morocco aligned itself with NAM, the African Group and OIC, and highlighted the importance of the Declaration on the Right to Development. The right to development could not be disassociated from other rights. It was a right of human beings, as well as of nations, and called for greater political commitment, through development cooperation and assistance. It was a priority in overcoming vulnerabilities and required the sharing of national and international responsibilities. Morocco shared concerns about the slow pace of progress on the mandate of the Working Group and called on Member States to be led by wisdom and to adopt a humanistic and consensual approach.

37. Switzerland believed the right to development could bring human rights and development closer together and was yet another means to promote all human rights. Indeed, while the full implementation of human rights for all was the ultimate goal of development and human rights should thus be used to measure the outcomes of development, governance principles and the rule of law were also paramount for shaping the process of development at the national and international levels. In that context, Switzerland reaffirmed the universality, indivisibility, interrelatedness, interdependence and mutually reinforcing nature of all civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights, including the right to development; those human rights should be realized for all, without any discrimination. Concerning the post-2015 development agenda, respect for and the promotion of all human rights, including the right to development, and how to make them accountable and to whom were the key issue. Switzerland did not subscribe to the view that the Working Group should discuss the post-2015 development agenda at the current stage, since it did not want to prejudge the discussions going on in New York on that issue. But it would not oppose the Working Group discussing it at a later stage. Finally, the Working Group should complete at the current session the first reading of the draft right to development criteria and very operational subcriteria, in the absence of a meaningful discussion on the issue of indicators that was fundamental to Switzerland.

38. The United States of America asserted that the right to development must be unifying rather than divisive and expressed its willingness to engage constructively in the Working Group. It expressed the need for a shared consensus on the definition and nature of the right to development and welcomed the participation of experts, civil society and

private actors. With regard to the process going forward, an empirical approach was a critical need and, in that context, some sort of measurable elements were necessary. That approach was not intended to rank and criticize States, but rather, as described by the High Commissioner for Human Rights, to be a potential bridge between human rights and development. While the United States recognized that some delegations believed the high-level task force was not mandated to produce indicators, operational subcriteria had been proposed by it and were referred to in Human Rights Council resolutions. The task force's operational subcriteria included indicators. The United States was prepared to seek consensus through the incorporation of measurability into the subcriteria. With regard to substance, the focus needed to be on universal human rights, which individuals enjoyed and might demand from their own governments, including civil and political, as well as economic, social and cultural rights. International financial institutions had no human rights obligations and States had no human rights. Instead, States had human rights obligations towards their citizens. The United States emphasized the importance of focusing on factors that included non-discrimination by States, democracy, good governance and social protection policies, including such related aspects as labour organization, women's rights, the prevention of violence against women and girls, and ways to protect, include and empower members of minority and vulnerable groups. Much development came from private sources and that fact warranted the Working Group's consideration.

39. Speaking on behalf of OHCHR, the Chief of the Development and Economic and Social Issues Branch presented the work of the Office on the post-2015 development agenda. The Office was actively engaged in the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals, and the Declaration on the Right to Development was central to OHCHR advocacy. The Working Group on the Right to Development was particularly relevant to the making of the new agenda and goals. The Millennium Development Goals left several gaps, including lack of accountability. The OHCHR approach was to integrate all human rights through research, advocacy and engagement with States, civil society and others. The High Commissioner was engaged in the process and, in an open letter to all Member States, had called for a new, universal and balanced development agenda, which upheld all human rights. She had emphasized the need to focus on equality, the right to development and the accountability of all actors. The Office gave technical support, including in a briefing paper dedicated to human rights and the right to development. OHCHR had stated that the current model of development was imbalanced and unsustainable and the global crises had exacerbated inequalities, both within and between countries. The focus on average statistics and aggregates was the main failing of the Millennium Development Goals. The new agenda must enable the measuring of outcomes and efforts, and disaggregation, and all targets and indicators must be aligned with human rights standards.

40. OHCHR had called for a new development agenda, which promoted and protected freedom from fear and want for all people without discrimination. Its central objective must be the eradication of extreme poverty. Inequalities should be a central concern, and the related but different notions of non-discrimination, equity and equality must be integrated and reflected across all the goals. Inequality must be disaggregated and dedicated targets and goals must be adopted for target groups. Attention should be paid to marginalized groups and those bearing unequal environmental burdens, such as small island developing States. The Declaration on the Right to Development placed people at the centre of development, called for an enabling environment and addressed both national and international constraints on development. Enhanced international cooperation and human rights-based policy coherence were needed to ensure that global rules and policies were consistent with human rights law. The new agenda must contain explicit provisions to remove obstacles to development, for instance in trade, investment and intellectual property systems, which undermined human rights. Meaningful reforms at the international level and

the democratization of institutions of global governance were essential. States must have the policy space to protect the human rights of their people and must be held accountable. Strong accountability mechanisms must be put in place and private actors must be held to account, including through due diligence, human rights impact assessments and the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. The new goals must be universally applicable while taking into account different national realities. The right to development provided substance to article 28 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which called for a social and international order in which all human rights could be realized.

41. The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) stated that climate change must be addressed and that the right to information and access to information were critical in relation to the environment and climate, and were also in line with the right to development. Some countries had acknowledged the importance of climate change in their constitutions. Scientific predictions and information must be factored into policies, and the sharing of information and access to data were essential. WMO facilitated free and unrestricted exchange of data for environmental protection. It was supporting an initiative for the recovery and collection of historical data from past colonial institutions for vulnerable countries. That was important for the assessment of long-term trends. WMO contributed to the fulfilment of human rights by supporting peoples' safety and security from weather, water and natural hazards.

42. The United Nations Children's Fund perceived a close linkage between the right to development and children's rights and welcomed the focus on sustainable, human-centred, rights-based development and equity. Children were the basis for future generations. Their vulnerabilities were interdependent; addressing those vulnerabilities comprehensively was important for improving their lives. The reduction of inequalities, the protection of children's rights, the strengthening of social services and the protection of women and children must be reflected in the efforts of the Working Group. There must be tangible results for the most excluded in society. That required data disaggregated by age, and data on all grounds of discrimination, including sex, age, race, ethnicity and income, relevant to countries and their contexts. The Working Group's discussions must contribute to the post-2015 process, as the right to development pointed in the same direction as the sustainable development goals of eradicating poverty, enhancing the sharing of resources and fostering intergenerational equity.

43. The International Telecommunication Union (ITU) promoted and ensured access to the benefits of scientific progress, which was one of the attributes of the right to development. International and communications technology and broadband could enhance the quality of life, improve access to information and empower people to participate in local and national development and to exercise their rights. Referring to article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, ITU asserted that the digital divide must be bridged through improved awareness, access and inclusion of the most vulnerable. The digital revolution was also providing tools for poverty reduction, and information and communications technology could narrow the pervasive divides within countries, for instance between urban, rural and other populations, and between developed and developing countries.

44. Speaking on behalf of the Catholic-inspired Working Group for the Right to Development and International Solidarity, the Association Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII appealed to Member States to overcome the political impasse in the Working Group and move from rhetoric to action. That group of non-governmental organizations had submitted three written contributions on the revision of criteria and operational subcriteria. It proposed the compilation of a report reflecting all comments on the first reading before proceeding to the second reading. Between the first and second readings, the group proposed a two-year phase of implementation to ensure the effectiveness of the criteria and

subcriteria. It suggested that experts be selected at the national level and tasked with making proposals on indicators. The Working Group must listen to the people whose lives depended on the implementation of the right to development. The collection of good practices and the involvement of national organizations could support its work.

45. The International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations recalled that, in 1986, the overwhelming majority of Member States had supported the Declaration on the Right to Development. That right was necessary for the enjoyment of all other human rights and must eventually be embodied in a legally binding framework. The Movement expressed difficulty in understanding how some States continued to object to the substance of the right to development or a legally binding framework. It called on all to strongly commit themselves to the right to development. That was required by morality, as well as by law, as that right was part of customary international law. The Movement perceived a challenge in the discussion of measurability by States that had not all unambiguously agreed on the right to development. Every major human rights instrument had been created by first agreeing on a legal obligation and defining the core principles, and only then considering mechanisms to measure whether or not a right was being respected. Only if all parties agreed on the legal obligation could that measurement be discussed. It urged States to cooperate on the right to development and called on the Working Group to consider how it could contribute to the Open Working Group in defining the post-2015 development agenda and sustainable development goals.

46. Friedrich Ebert Stiftung asserted that the right to development belonged to individuals and peoples, and its implementation was crucial to the post-2015 development agenda. Implementation must take place at all levels, from local to global. Friedrich Ebert Stiftung suggested that, on completion of the first reading of the criteria and subcriteria, the Working Group should request the Human Rights Council to mandate its Advisory Committee to support work on measurement and monitoring, building on the work done in the Sub-Commission which had not received any follow-up. Expert advice could serve to unlock political debate and the work of the high-level task force could provide useful guidance. It was necessary to look at the options for the way forward and for the monitoring and measurability, as well as the legal standing, of the right to development.

47. The China NGO Network for International Exchanges stated that the criteria and subcriteria represented a historic milestone on the right to development. In the pursuit of sustainable development, it was necessary to look at the right to development, rights-based development and the human rights-based approach; and national and international obligations. States were not denied rights under the right to development, the biggest obstacle to which was the unequal world order. The right to development supported all countries to have equal opportunities for development. In the spirit of the Declaration on the Right to Development, that right promoted global justice. It supported the solution of problems of poverty, North-South inequality, inequality in financial systems and an unequal international and social order. The right to development encompassed all human rights, but was not limited to the sum total of all human rights in the two International Covenants; rather, it built on them and added further value to them. Human rights provided for protection at the national level, while the right to development needed to be implemented first at the international level. While States had the primary responsibility at the national level, the right to development required differentiated standards and responsibilities at the international level. It called for greater inclusiveness and participation in global governance, and required addressing not only outcomes, but also policies. The proposed indicators were mostly national rather than international, and more indicators were needed for the global level. The right to development required an institutional guarantee and was not about international charity. National and international obligations must be given more content, and a regional dimension should also be included.

48. The full text of general statements made available to the secretariat is posted on the OHCHR website (www.ohchr.org).

B. Inter-sessional meeting and informal consultations by the Chair

49. The Chair-Rapporteur reported[4] on the informal inter-sessional meeting of the Working Group, which was held on 3 and 4 April 2014 in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 24/4. She also reported on the informal consultations she had held with coordinators of regional and political groups, United Nations system organizations and intergovernmental bodies, as well as non-governmental organizations, in preparation for the informal inter-sessional meeting of the Working Group and its fifteenth session.

50. The main issue discussed was how to most effectively utilize the time should the Working Group complete the first reading of the criteria and operational subcriteria before the end of its fifteenth session. Groups of States representing developing countries had proposed that, in line with its mandate to consider, revise and refine the draft right to development criteria and corresponding operational subcriteria, the Group should proceed with the second reading. Others stated that the measurability element must first be clarified.

51. Some concerns raised related to the overall orientation of the Working Group and whether the review exercise was expedient for elaborating a legally binding instrument, and in that context a broader discussion had been proposed on how best to achieve the ultimate goal. There had also been a suggestion that the Working Group should consider adopting a position on the right to development for incorporation in the post-2015 development agenda.

52. During consultations with NGOs, the importance of addressing the problem of unilateral coercive measures was underlined. Ways needed to be found to integrate youth concerns more concretely into the draft right to development criteria, and modalities established to enable indigenous peoples to participate in the work of the Working Group on an equal basis.

53. With respect to the inter-sessional meeting, the Chair-Rapporteur reported that, at the outset of the meeting, she had underlined the need for the Group to bear in mind its larger mandate when carrying out the specific task entrusted to it for the fifteenth session. In its resolution 4/4 and in subsequent resolutions, the Human Rights Council had decided that, once considered, revised and endorsed, the criteria and subcriteria should be used, as appropriate, in the elaboration of a comprehensive and coherent set of right to development standards for the implementation of the right to development, and that the Working Group should take appropriate steps for ensuring respect for and the application of those standards, which could take various forms, including guidelines on the implementation of the right to development, and evolve into a basis for consideration of an international legal standard of a binding nature through a collaborative process of engagement.

54. The Working Group's original mandate in Commission on Human Rights resolution 1998/72 was to monitor progress on the implementation of the right to development, as elaborated in the Declaration on the Right to Development, at the national and international levels, provide recommendations and further analyse obstacles to its enjoyment.

55. Several proposals had been made with a view to improving the effectiveness of work at the fifteenth session, but no agreement had been reached. Many developing country

[4] The Chair-Rapporteur's oral report on the informal inter-sessional meeting of the Working Group is available from www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Development/Pages/15thSession.aspx.

representatives had expressed concern that none of the NAM proposals had been accepted, and the Secretariat had been called upon to clarify the voting procedure. NAM had expressed the view that while consensus must be the aim, voting might become necessary if, despite all efforts, consensus could not be reached.

56. The Chair proceeded to summarize the various proposals made and the discussions on the proposals.

57. NAM had proposed that, after completion of the first reading and in line with the mandate to consider, revise and refine the draft right to development criteria and corresponding operational subcriteria with a view to their endorsement, the Group recommend to the Human Rights Council that it proceed to the second reading at its sixteenth session and, in that regard, flagged the need for more time to be allocated to the Working Group.

58. In that respect, EU, the United States and Switzerland had stated that the issue of measurability must be clarified before proceeding to the second reading and that it was too early to discuss the conclusions and recommendations of the Group's fifteenth session.

59. NAM, Algeria, Cuba and Pakistan had asserted that the Working Group had no mandate to discuss indicators, that the high-level task force had gone beyond its mandate by proposing indicators and that in no case could a matter outside the mandate of the Working Group be used as a condition for the fulfilment of the mandate given to it by the Human Rights Council. Pakistan and Indonesia had suggested that the issue of measurability be considered simultaneously with the second reading. NGOs expressed the view that the question of measurability would arise only in the implementation phase and that, given the subjective character of the right to development, indicators must be determined by the people themselves at the local and national levels and be based on their specific needs and requirements. A collective of NGOs suggested proceeding with the second reading with a parallel debate on indicators, using input from a pilot project that would seek to apply the proposed criteria and subcriteria, and from an expert group set up for the purpose.

60. NAM, Egypt and Sri Lanka had proposed an exchange of ideas on integration of the right to development in the post-2015 development agenda. South Africa had underlined the importance of supporting a right to development approach as opposed to the human rights-based approach to development, which focused on civil and political rights

61. EU, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States were of the view that the ongoing discussions on the post-2015 agenda should not be prejudged or the process duplicated, and that all human rights, not just the right to development, were crucial to the post-2015 development agenda. Algeria, Cuba, the Islamic Republic of Iran and Tunisia, as well as the Association of World Citizens, had argued that many Human Rights Council resolutions already contained explicit language on the process and that the Working Group's contributions, being more specific, would only complement the more general discussions and would be welcomed.

62. NAM had proposed that, while bearing in mind that completion of the first reading was the priority, a letter should be sent to relevant United Nations organizations and specialized agencies requesting them, when making their contributions, to relate their activities also to the post-2015 development agenda.

63. EU, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States had argued that United Nations organizations and specialized agencies should be free to decide on the content of their contributions. If a specific request was to be made to them, then it should also include a request to express their views on indicators.

64. Switzerland had proposed as a compromise that, in the letter, United Nations agencies should be invited to feel free to respond to questions that might be posed, including on integrating the right to development in the post-2015 development agenda.

65. Indonesia, Pakistan and Sri Lanka had been of the view that political will was lacking to join together internationally to implement the Declaration on the Right to Development and that, therefore, it was important to adopt a systemic approach that would permit discussion on the international system, on the need for an enabling environment and on identification of obstacles at the international level.

66. The Indian Council of South America had proposed establishing a process whereby indigenous peoples could participate in the work of the Working Group on an equal basis, taking into account their special status as peoples entitled to the exercise of the right to self-determination. One NGO had proposed that a privileged place be accorded to the participation of young people in the work of the Working Group, given their importance in society and their special responsibility for the future of humanity. NGOs had called for the compilation of all the comments made during the review process on criteria and operational subcriteria.

C. Submissions of groups of States, States, regional groups and other stakeholders

67. The Human Rights Council, in its resolution 24/4, endorsed the recommendations adopted by the Working Group on the Right to Development at its fourteenth session, in which, inter alia, the Working Group requested OHCHR to make available on its website and to the Working Group at its fifteenth session, in the format of two conference room papers, all further submissions by Governments, groups of Governments and regional groups, as well as inputs by other stakeholders. The Chair-Rapporteur provided a summary of the submissions as follows.

68. In response to its letter dated 5 July 2013, the Secretariat received 4 submissions from groups of States (2 from NAM and 2 from EU), 33 from Member States, 10 from United Nations organizations, 4 from national human rights institutions (2 from the National Human Rights Commission of India and 1 each from the Independent Human Rights Commission of Afghanistan and the Advisory Council on Human Rights of Morocco), 1 from a United Nations treaty body (the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights), 4 joint submissions from NGOs (3 from Catholic-inspired NGOs and 1 from an indigenous peoples' organization) and 12 individual submissions from civil society organizations and academics. Those submissions are in addition to comments made during the past three sessions. All the submissions have been posted in their original versions on the OHCHR website and have also been compiled in documents A/HRC/WG.2/15/CRP.3 and 4.

69. The content and focus of the contributions varied, ranging from general statements to specific proposals. One submission expressed concern that the draft right to development criteria and operational subcriteria sought to redefine the right to development and were conceived of, with their focus on the national dimension, as a tool to monitor the actions of States. However, the main objective of the exercise should be the creation of the necessary basis for the elaboration of a legally binding instrument. The focus of the criteria must be on achieving the conditions for economic development and strengthening the ability of States to promote and protect all human rights. Underdevelopment was not an intrinsic property of one or several countries, but the result of colonization and looting. International responsibility and collective action should therefore focus on creating the conditions necessary for the full realization of the right to development.

70. Another submission recommended specific indicators and reformulation of a subcriterion to reflect the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on development, and further indicators for measuring the elimination of sexual exploitation and human trafficking. One submission provided an overview of steps taken at the national level to ensure the realization of the right to development, steps taken in international cooperation and steps taken at the regional level, such as the drafting of a regional human development report focusing on the right to development.

71. A joint submission from civil society organizations emphasized the urgent need to fully implement the right to development to overcome structural obstacles at the international and national levels. The post-2015 development agenda should be aligned with the human rights-based approach and focus on the right to development. While indicators were necessary to monitor the implementation of the right to development, they should be determined after agreement had been reached on the criteria and subcriteria. Experts might be more competent and neutral in identifying indicators, while States should indicate specific national subparameters for responding to the needs of a specific population/country. The criteria and operational subcriteria should reflect all the articles of the Declaration on the Right to Development, including its preamble, as the principal source. The criteria and subcriteria must address structural imbalances and remove obstacles to the realization of an enabling international and national environment for implementing the right to development.

72. One contribution cautioned against further expanding the list of criteria and subcriteria. On attribute 2, "Participatory human rights processes," it suggested that the relevance of constitution-building processes in the consolidation of the rule of law, and the role of electoral participation in the strengthening of democracy should be emphasized, and the participation of women, youth and ethnic minorities in those processes, especially in the context of post-conflict reconstruction and peacebuilding, should be advocated. On attribute 3, "Social justice in development," it encouraged, all possible mutual feedback with the post-2015 development agenda, including on structural change and social covenants for equality. It called for specific attention to sustainable development and the equitable use of natural resources.

73. Another contribution emphasized the need for non-discrimination in development and the fair sharing of the benefits and burdens of development. It advocated a mixed economy as the most suited to create favourable conditions for development, and highlighted social safety nets, green technology, health-care systems and education as important elements for achieving development. Another submission shared information on experiences in promoting women's leadership and participation.

74. One submission pointed out that the draft right to development criteria and operational subcriteria did not clearly clarify the core elements and principles of the right to development and the responsibilities which the international community, especially developed countries, should assume to implement that right. It suggested revising the draft criteria and subcriteria to strike a balance between "human rights-based development" and "the right to development"; between "development as a human right" and "human rights as development"; and between international responsibility and domestic responsibility. The submission contained several concrete proposals for revising the draft subcriteria, formulating new subcriteria, and revising and/or proposing indicators. While underlining that further studies and new international legal instruments were needed, such as a convention on the right to development, the suggestion was made that guidelines should be elaborated for implementing the Declaration on the Right to Development. It was necessary to distinguish between the right to development and human rights-based development and human rights. It was pointed out that the right to development emphasized fair and equal opportunities for development among subjects at different stages of development, with the

aim of eliminating the gap between developed and developing countries, especially least developed countries. The need to focus also on good governance at the international level was underlined. Another submission provided information on the key role of women and made concrete proposals for fostering and promoting their role for development.

D. Review of progress in the implementation of the right to development, including consideration, revision and refinement of the right to development criteria and operational subcriteria

75. At its 2nd to 6th meetings, from 12 to 14 May, the Working Group considered and revised the draft operational right to development subcriteria listed in the annex to addendum 2 to the report of the high-level task force (A/HRC/15/WG.2/ TF/2/Add.2) under attributes 2 "Participatory human rights processes" and 3 "Social justice in development", as well as proposals for additional subcriteria.

76. Throughout the consideration of the operational subcriteria, a few speakers introduced or sought to introduce the element of measurability, ranging from indicators to monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of human rights. Raising concerns, reservations and objections, the overwhelming majority of developing country Member States maintained that indicators, whether so named or under the guise of measurability, were clearly outside the mandate of the Working Group and had also been outside the scope of the mandate of the high-level task force on the implementation of the right to development. They contended that indicators did not make a positive contribution to the Working Group's objective of elaborating a comprehensive and coherent set of standards for the implementation of the right to development, in accordance with the resolutions of the Human Rights Council.

77. A broad range of perspectives emerged in the consideration of individual subcriteria, and new subcriteria were also proposed. In the discussion of international conventions, some speakers emphasized the implementation of all instruments relating to human rights, the environment and labour, focusing on the disadvantaged and marginalized. Others raised questions about the source of the notions of disadvantaged and marginalized in previous intergovernmental agreements. On national legal protection of human rights, some speakers advocated the inclusion of constitutional and legislative guarantees, and proposed that the particular role of national human rights institutions set up in accordance with the Paris Principles should be highlighted, while others preferred measures to improve the global partnership and achieve the internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals. For a few Member States, the right to development remains an ambiguous concept. For the majority, it is a human right that must be reflected in all discussions on human rights.

78. Some speakers favoured the human rights-based approach to development for national development strategies, while others opposed it on the basis that it did not take account of different levels of development. Some suggested that the right to development approach should replace the human rights-based approach. One NGO suggested revising the draft criteria and subcriteria to strike a balance between "human rights-based development" and "the right to development"; between "development as a human right" and "human rights as development"; and between international responsibility and domestic responsibility.

79. The numerous, miscellaneous and detailed proposals on existing and new subcriteria included suggestions on human rights education, consultation with civil society, access to data and information, especially on climate and the environment, information management systems for responding to natural disasters, good governance, the rule of law and combating

corruption, decent work, access to good-quality employment, decent housing, preventing violence against women and girls, combating child, early and forced marriage, the elimination of sexual exploitation and human trafficking, the rights of migrant workers, the positive role of migrants in the globalization process, the elimination of all forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, colonialism and colonization, the right to self-determination of peoples which remain under colonial occupation, foreign domination and occupation, common but differentiated responsibilities, global good governance, international cooperation (North-South, South-South and triangular), the reform of international institutions, avoidance of unilateral coercive measures; strengthening national equitable land redistribution and rural development policies for historically disadvantaged peoples, including those affected by apartheid and colonialism, sovereignty over all natural wealth and resources, global financial architecture, the removal of inequities in global decision-making in international institutions, the removal of asymmetries in international trade, the elimination of tax havens, the elimination of debt, the root causes of climate change, development of a new model of international cooperation based on solidarity, the right to international solidarity, the right to peace and a legally binding framework for the right to development.

80. After concluding its consideration of the operational subcriteria, the Working Group considered agenda item 4 (d), "Other matters". NAM acknowledged that although progress had been made in completing the first reading, much remained to be done to overcome challenges and to narrow down divergences in a constructive and non-distractive way, which required a number of measures to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the Working Group. Those measures included: extending the Working Group's meeting time to two separate weeks annually; development by the Chair-Rapporteur of a road map; scaling up of the Chair-Rapporteur's informal and formal contacts; enhancing the mainstreaming of the right to development in United Nations agencies and other international organizations, as mandated by pertinent resolutions of the Human Rights Council and the United Nations General Assembly; and limiting the participation of NGOs to those in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council. NAM argued that additional meeting time was needed to expedite the work of the Working Group. Nothing prevented the Working Group from making a recommendation to that effect to the Human Rights Council for endorsement at its twenty-seventh session. NAM further explained that it was not against indicators, but was of the view that they should not be copied from the task force report and pasted under subcriteria. India recognized that some useful contributions had been made during the first reading, but expressed its reservations on including new issues like the right to peace, self-determination, and business and human rights. It supported the proposals of NAM and added that two annual meetings of 10 days would be required. India also observed that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should not be renegotiated through the work on the right to development. Pakistan expressed regret that the realization of the right to development was lagging far behind and continued to face obstacles in moving forward. It expressed the need to commence the second reading and to find alternatives for consensus building.

81. EU, supported by the United States and Switzerland, explained that it was not prepared to begin a second reading before resolving some critical divergences, such as on measurability, the road map, additional meeting time and the participation of all non-governmental organizations whether or not they were in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council, in order to ensure that the second reading would be productive. EU underscored that the participation of United Nations agencies and international organizations, with only 3 participating at the session of the 11 that had confirmed that they would participate, should also be addressed. EU, the United States and Switzerland were of the view that the issue of meeting time should be resolved at the Human Rights Council session in September 2014. On the participation of NGOs, the

Chair-Rapporteur called on the Secretariat to explain the applicable rules. It was consequently clarified that unless otherwise laid down in the resolutions establishing subsidiary bodies of the Human Rights Council, such as the Social Forum, participation in them was limited to NGOs in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council. However, the Working Group could consider and agree to expanding the participation of NGOs to include those not in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council, in which case it should make a recommendation to that effect for endorsement by the Human Rights Council.

IV. Conclusions and recommendations

82. At the final meeting of its fifteenth session, on 16 May 2014, the Working Group on the Right to Development adopted, by consensus, its conclusions and recommendations, in accordance with its mandate established by Commission on Human Rights resolution 1998/72.

A. Conclusions

83. The Working Group took note of documents A/HRC/WG.2/15/CRP.3 and 4 containing detailed views and comments submitted by Governments, groups of Governments, regional groups and other relevant stakeholders in fulfilment of the conclusions and recommendations agreed at its fourteenth session.

84. The Working Group expressed appreciation to all those who contributed with their submissions and inputs.

85. The Working Group welcomed the presentation made by the Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group and commended her for the able stewardship in guiding the deliberations of the Working Group.

86. The Working Group welcomed the presence and participation and took note of the opening remarks delivered by the High Commissioner and the participation of OHCHR, which attested to her commitment and that of her Office to promoting and protecting the realization of the right to development and to enhancing support from relevant bodies of the United Nations system for that purpose, consistent with General Assembly resolution 48/141.

87. The Working Group took note of the continuation of the process of considering, revising and refining the draft criteria and the corresponding operational subcriteria contained in document A/HRC/15/WG.2/TF/2/Add.2, and welcomed the completion of the first reading of the draft criteria and operational subcriteria.

88. The Working Group will further consider, revise and refine the aforementioned draft criteria and corresponding operational subcriteria, as mandated by the Human Rights Council in its resolution 24/4.

89. The Working Group regretted the low attendance of invited experts from international organizations and, in that context, urged their broader engagement and re-emphasized the importance of engaging further the relevant United Nations agencies, funds and programmes and institutions, as well as other multilateral institutions and forums, international organizations and other relevant stakeholders.

B. Recommendations

90. **The Working Group recommended the following:**

(a) To continue to accomplish its mandate including, in particular, to consider, revise and refine the draft right to development criteria and corresponding operational subcriteria;

(b) To request the Chair-Rapporteur to further her efforts to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Working Group, with a view to accomplishing its mandate, including through drafting a framework for consideration at the sixteenth session of the Working Group, in consultation with regional and political groups;

(c) To request OHCHR to make available on its website and to the Working Group two conference room papers reflecting comments and views submitted during the session by Governments, groups of Governments and regional groups, as well as by other relevant stakeholders, respectively;

(d) To also request OHCHR to make available on its website and to the next session of the Working Group, in the format of two conference room papers, all further submissions by Governments, groups of Governments and regional groups, as well as inputs by other stakeholders;

(e) To invite the Chair-Rapporteur to hold informal consultations with Governments, groups of Governments, regional groups and relevant stakeholders in preparation for the sixteenth session of the Working Group;

(f) To invite the High Commissioner and to request the Chair-Rapporteur, with the support of OHCHR, to intensify their efforts towards further engagement and active participation of all relevant stakeholders, in particular key relevant international organizations and civil society organizations, in the work of the Working Group, consistent with paragraph 89 above.

Annex I

Agenda

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Election of the Chair-Rapporteur.
3. Adoption of the agenda and programme of work.
4. Review of progress in the implementation of the right to development, including consideration, revision and refinement of the right to development criteria and operational subcriteria (A/HRC/15/WG.2/TF/2/Add.2).
5. Adoption of conclusions and recommendations.
6. Adoption of the report.

Annex II

[English only]

List of attendance

Members of the Human Rights Council

Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Morocco, Namibia, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

States Members of the United Nations

Australia, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Colombia, Croatia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Latvia, Libya, Malaysia, Mauritius, Paraguay, Rwanda, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uruguay

Non-member States represented by an observer

Holy See, State of Palestine

United Nations funds, programmes, specialized agencies and related organizations

International Telecommunication Union, United Nations Children's Fund, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, World Meteorological Organization

Intergovernmental organizations

African Union, European Union, Organization of the Islamic Conference

Non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council

General

China NGO Network for International Exchange (CNIE), CIVICUS – World Alliance for Citizen Participation, International Youth, New Humanity, Student Movement for the United Nations

Special

Association Points-Coeur, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, Collectif des Femmes Africaines du Hainaut , Dominicans for Justice and Peace - Order of Preachers, European Union of Women, International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education (OIDEL), Myochikai (Arigatou Foundation)

Roster

Friedrich Ebert Stiftung